DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 014 EA 012 690

AUTHOR Miller, Marilyn F.; DuVall, Charles R.
TITLE An Annotated Bibliography of Literature Dealing With the Issues of Sectarian Schools and Vouchering.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., South Bend.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catholic Schools; *Educational Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Government School Relationship; *Private Schools; *Tax Credits

ABSTRACT

Entries in this annotated bibliography are listed under five headings. (1) Sectarian Schools - Critical: this contains 30 citations from periodicals and "New York Times" articles, editorials, letters, and advertisements. (2) Sectarian Schools - Balanced: this contains 36 citations from periodicals and "New York Times" articles and letters. (3) Vouchering - Favorable: this has four citations from periodicals. (4) Vouchering - Balanced: this has two citations from periodicals. (5) Vouchering - Critical: this contains three citations from periodicals and the "Times Educational Supplement." (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187014

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERATURE DEALING WITH THE ISSUES OF SECTARIAN SCHOOLS AND VOUCHERING

BY

Marilyn F. Miller

Graduate Student

and

Charles R. DuVall

Instructor

Indiana University at South Bend

Division of Education

1700 Mishawaka Avenue

South Bend, Indiana 46615

November 1979

EA 012 690

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Miller

C. DuVall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sectarian Schools - Critical

Brout, Betty Lea. (Letter.) New York Times.
March 11, 1978. 22:2.

Brout stands against government aid to private schools since 90 percent of U.S. nonpublic schools are religious in nature. She states that the use of public funds to support religious institutions is a violation of the constitutional mandate of separation of church and state.

Carter, President Jimmy. New York Times.
March 1, 1978. II, 14:1.

President Carter said he is committed to constitutional aid to private schools, "an important part of our diverse educational system," but that he doubts the constitutionality of the tax credit plan. He said a special Office of Nonpublic Schools would be established which would insure equal participation of private school students in all applicable federal programs.

Carter, President Jimmy. (Address.) New York Times.
April 12, 1978. 17:2.

President Carter reaffirmed his opposition to tuition tax credits. He said that the bill would be too costly and unconstitutional. He also stated it was unfair to ask a middle income taxpayer to pay taxes to help a richer family send their child to a private school.

Doerr, Edd. "The Packwood-Moynihan Boondoggle."
Humanist. January 1978. Pp. 51-52.

Doerr believes the tax credit bill is costly and unconstitutional. He believes if everyone had to support religious institutions through taxes it would be a violation of the right to support the religious institution of one's free choice. He also believes the aid would destroy the public schools, proliferate nonpublic schools, and would divide the country along religious, racial, and class lines.

Doerr, Edd. "The Packwood-Moynihan Boondoggle,
Part II." Humanist. March 1978. P.56.

Doerr reiterates objections to the tax credit bill, including the charge that public schools might start asking tuition also. Doerr traces the origins of the bill back to primarily Catholic and political concerns of the 1976 presidential campaign.

Doerr, Edd. (Letter.) Harpers. June 1978. P.4+.

Doerr contends that Moynihan in arguing for tuition tax credit omitted and distorted certain facts. Moynihan purports that the tax credit is constitutional, while Doerr contends that the Supreme Court has considered the parochial schools to be an integral part of their church's mission, and governmental aid would violate the principle of separation of church and state. Moynihan claims it is no longer a Catholic issue and that he has popular support; Doerr traces the bill's origins to five Catholic sponsors, and cites ten state-wide referendums in which voters were against aid to parochial schools. Moynihan says without the bill nonpublic school enrollment would decline, Doerr says Protestant schools haven't been hindered in the past while the Catholic school decline was found to be unrelated to economic factors.

Doerr, Edd. (Letter.) New York Times.
July 21, 1978. 24:4.

Doerr argues that taxes going to private schools is "taxation without representation" since the voter has no control over the private school. He also argues that parochial schools tend to divide children along religious and other lines and would "seriously weaken the bonds that hold our nation and our communities together."

Editorial. New York Times. March 2, 1978
18:1

The editor disapproves the tuition tax credit bill saying the theory must have been, "everyone loves a handout," and that it distributes "too much money in too small amounts too widely." He says the measure would threaten to change the basic role of public schools, and might dismantle public education entirely.

Editorial. "Tuition Credits Fail Every Test."
New York Times. April 14, 1978. 26:1.

The editor argues that the proposed tuition tax credit would unfairly aid the rich, and would subsidize the withdrawal of children from the public schools. He says the tax aid would also be unconstitutional since it would amount to state support of religion.

Hollings, Ernest F. "The Case Against Tuition Tax Credits." Phi Delta Kappan. December 1978. Pp. 277-279.

Senator Hollings cites many objections and fallacies to the Packwood-Moynihan proposal, and lists 44 national organizations that also oppose aid to private schools in this manner. His basic philosophy is summed up in these words: "The government's duty... is to provide public schools. The duty of the government toward private schools is to leave them alone."

New York Times. March 22, 1978. II, 4:1.

A coalition of school groups starts a nationwide campaign against tuition tax credits, charging that it would be an "alarming threat" to public education. Shanker says the credits would create "hucksterism" among private schools. President Carter said the bill would be too costly and would not really help out the poor.

New York Times. April 22, 1978. 22:4.

Critics think that the amendment to include public schools as well as nonpublic schools, to avoid the constitutionality question on the tax credit bill, will encourage public schools to start charging tuition for everything, instead of only for special programs as they do now. They say it would erode the "free education" concept.

New York Times. April 27, 1978. II, 2:1.

The Balck Caucus praises President Carter for his opposition to tuition tax credits for parents who send their children to private schools.

Ornauer, Richard L. "School Taxes and the Common Good." (Letter.) New York Times. January 29, 1978. XXI, 14:5.

Ornauer objects to supporters of the tax credit plan who want exemption from taxes for public school services which they do not use. He says that the taxpayer cannot get exemptions from other municipal services which he does not happen to use, such as courts, prisons, railroads, welfare, police, or highways, and believes that public schools should be no exception.

Pfeffer, Leo. (Letter.) Harpers. June 1973. P. 4+.

Pfeffer disagrees with Moynihan's supposition that his bill is constitutional. Pfeffer cites the 1973 Nyquist and the 1947 Everson cases to support his position that the Supreme Court has always been against governmental aid to the "anti-Catholic" label is incorrect since among those opposing the bill are Catholic leaders such as HEW Secretary Califano.

Rubin, Max J. (Letter.) New York Times. May 13, 1978. 22:4.

Rubin says that the Packwood-Moynihan bill is unfair and unconstitutional. He proposes that recipients of the bill would later ask for more aid, and that vast numbers of private schools (Many discriminatory) would rise up to take advantage of the aid, leaving the public schools with only the "troubled, handicapped, and poverty stricken." This, Rubin says, would destroy the "greatest unifying force in our pluralistic society... the public shcool."

Rubin, Max J. (Letter.) New York Times. June 10, 1978. 18:4.

Rubin raises some objections to the tax credit's unfair aid to private schools. He states that private schools are already unfairly aided since they can choose not to enroll the "disruptive and deficient" while public schools must provide for all students. He also warns that if government subsidizes private schools to guarantee the right of choice, it is the same as saying that government should subsidize churches for the same reason.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times. March 5, 1978. IV, 9:5.

Shanker quotes federal aid as $128 per pupil, and states that the tuition tax credit would unfairly give the private school student up to $500 per pupil. He states that if "you don't like swimming in the neighborhood pool,... don't ask the federal government to help pay for (your) private pool." He also fears a mass exodus of students to private schools divided by race and class, leaving the public schools with only the poor or academically low students, which would in turn diminish the strength and sense of national community the country gains from the differing public school students growing up together.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times.
March 12, 1978. IV, 9:5.

Shanker reiterates his opposition to the tax credit proposal saying the plan would unfairly aid private school students, and the amount of aid asked for each year would undoubtedly increase. He also fears that a resulting mass exodus of students to private schools would mean the closing of many public schools, and the reduction of the work force in many more.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times.
April 9, 1978. IV, 9:5.

Shanker states that it is unfair for the public to pay for private schools, and unconstitutional, since more than 80 percent of the nonpublic school students attend religiously oriented schools. He also objects to the tax credit bill, hypothesizing that if given federal aid this year, next year supporters will want state and local aid too.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times.
April 16, 1978. IV, 9:5.

Shanker outlines how private schools already have unfair competition with public schools. He says private schools can reject disruptive or handicapped students, and be selective and segregated, while public schools must educate all students regardless of race, language, or physical condition. Also, private schools may not be covered by fair labor laws or certification requirements, while public schools must comply with all the laws. Shankers lists groups, including the National Council of Churches, which influenced the House to eliminate elementary schools from the proposal, for tax credit.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times.
April 30, 1978. IV, 9:5.

Shanker urges the National Coalition to Save Public Education and other groups to not give up the fight against the proposed tuition tax credit bill.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times.
May 7, 1978. IV, 11:4.

Shanker re-emphasizes that the tax credit's simplicity is deceptive since it unjustly favors the rich. The rich sending their children to more expensive institutions would receive the full tax break, while the tax credit would not give enough aid to the poor and the middle class.

Shanker, Albert. (Letter.) "How to weaken our public schools." New York Times. May 18, 1978. 22:4.

Shanker puts forth the analogy that if people were offered $500 to build their own pool, many would take the money and run. So he hypothesizes if parents received $500 to place their children in private schools, many would do so, and then ask for more money. Shanker further states that the loss of students to the public school system would weaken the schools and force the reduction of staff.

Shanker, Albert. (Adv.) New York Times. May 21, 1978. IV, 9:4.

Shanker objects to the tax credit plan as fostering unfair competition between private and public schools by taking students away from the public schools and favoring the rich. He also fears the bill will result in higher tuition and a request for more aid next year. He lists more than thirty groups opposed to the plan, including several church related groups: The American Jewish Congress, Baptists Joint Committee on Public Affairs, United Methodist Church, and the United Presbyterian Church.

Shanker, Albert. (Letter.) Harpers. June 1978. P.4.

Shanker discusses reasons the tax credit is unsatisfactory. He says it would promote segregation along church lines rather than provide variety; it would be an opening to call for more aid in years to come; and it would leave the public schools with only the poor, handicapped, less than superior achievers, and behavior problems. Shanker contends that support for the bill is simply a middle class "tax revolt" because of inflation and unemployment, rather than an actual affinity for the bill itself.

Sherry, Mary. "Is State Aid the Saving Grace of Catholic Education?" America. April 9, 1977. Pp. 327-8.

Sherry sees a problem with Catholic educators losing their perspective. Declining enrollment because of students moving to the suburbs, and an increase in lay (salaried) teachers, have caused the Catholic church to look for more ways to get money. The easy answer, Sherry says, is to look for more and more constitutional means of getting state aid. But she sees the problem with this as being added paperwork and the suffering of religious classes, since governmental funds cannot be used for religion. She believes the only right solution is to continue to teach about God utilizing the resources that have already been handed down.

Stair, Billy. "Renewed Struggle Between Public and Private Education: Tuition Tax Credits." Education Digest. December 1978. Pp. 7-10.

Stair repeats the agruments supportive of the tax aid: that it is unfair for parents of private school children to pay twice for their education, and that aid would promote pluralism. However, Stair states the case against the credit plan as ruining public education as middle class whites gain incentive to go to private schools. He sees politicians caught between constituent pressure and moral obligation. He poses problems as legal and constitutional(government initiating sectarian religion), philosophical and moral (giving the wealthy a tax break), and practical (letting all exit public schools except the poor, handicapped, and lower academic, along with racial tension).

Swomley, John M., Jr. "Tuition Tax Credits: Blank Check for churches; Packwood-Moynihan bill." Christian Century. May 3, 1978. Pp. 462-4.

Swomley traces the origin of the bill to the Republican National Committee's hiring of Father Donald Shea to help win the ethnic/Catholic vote. Other prominent Catholics joined to help form the bill, but stayed in the background when the bill was introduced so it would not be labeled "Catholic." Swomley argues that the bill would be very costly and unfair for non-Catholics to have to support Catholic schools.

Vorhaus, Michael A. (Letter.) New York Times. October 28, 1977. 30:3.

Vorhaus surmises that a tuition tax credit plan would draw clients away from higher priced institutions while at the same time encourage lower priced institutions to jack up their cost to get the additional tax credit funds. He concludes that the country would be losing $4.7 billion tax dollars, while the middle-income parents wouldn't get any relief.

Sectarian Schools - Balanced

DiPerna, Paula. "Tuition Tax Credits: Relief for which class?" Nation. August 1978. Pp. 143-6.

The author believes that the tax credit bill would ignore the poor altogether, do little for the middle class, and give pocket money to the rich. Supporters of the bill believe it would provide choice and diversity, yield a better product, would be simple to administer, and would reimburse those not using the public system. Opponents believe the measure is unfair, may lead to a mass exodus of students from the public schools, would encourage segregation, and may lead to a plea for more money in the future.

Editorial. "An American Issue." America. March 18, 1978. Pp. 199-200.

Critics to the Packwood-Moynihan measure include the Washington Post labeling it devisive and weakening to public education, President Carter calling it unconstitutional, and HEW Secretary Califano believing there should be a limit to the aid ceiling. Some say Congress would be giving four times as much aid to private as public schools, but this view ignores the fact that public schools are already fully supported by taxes collected principally at the state and local levels.

"Extending aid to education; Middle Income College Assistance Act and Tuition Tax Credit Act." Commonweal. March 3, 1978. P. 132.

Some hindrances to the plan are noted: it's cost, constitutionality, and the President's possible veto. Also noted are counter-arguments: the government can afford it; private schools are saving the taxpayer money and are a leaven to society; and the equality of all citizens and the survival of alternative education systems is at stake.

Gallagher, William P. and Baisinger, Grace. "Tax Credit for Private Schools; Pro and Con Discussion; Interviews." U.S. News and World Report. May 1, 1978. Pp. 69-70.

This discussion between a representative of Catholic School Parents and one from the Coalition to Save Public Education is set up in a question and answer format. It highlights some of the major arguments on each side of the tax credit issue.

Holt, Don. Hubbard, Henry W. Howard, Lucy. "School Tax Credits?" Newsweek. December 26, 1977. P. 76.

The plan has backers, the authors say, because any kind of tax credit has appeal to parents pinched by rising tuition costs. Opponents argue that two-thirds of the credit would be paid to families earning more than $25,000 and would thus be unfairly aiding the wealthy.

Kilpatrick, James. J. "Tuition Grants and Trojan Horses." Nations Business. October 1978. Pp. 17-18.

Kilpatrick sees little difference between the tax credit plan and the indirect aid that schools receive because contributors to sectarian schools can deduct contributions when computing their net taxable income. However, he warns supporters of the bill they may "win their battle and lose the war." If religious schools receive federal aid they become "recipient institutions" and are liable to a whole host of federal regulations, such as control over discrimination because of age, sex, race, religion, or national origin. Also schools have been asked to remove the sign of the cross from public buildings on their grounds.

New York Times. April 8, 1978. 10:6.

The article notes that "some congressmen say they have received more mail in support of tuition tax credits than they have received on any other issue since the Watergate scandel." Proponents say the plan is a less costly way of channeling dollars into taxpayers hands than that of administering loans and grants. Attorney General Bell opposes the plan referring to the 1973 court decision invalidating a similar reimbursement plan to families with children attending private schools.

New York Times. May 5, 1978. IV, 12:5.

The House has been pressured by their constituents who have sent in a volume of mail pleading for credit, second only to the volume of mail they received on the Watergate scandel. In support of the plan many Democrats and Republicans said the rise in tuition costs have priced many potential students out of the market. But Representative Parren J. Mitchell, a member of the House Black Caucus, said he feared the tax credit would re-establish school segregation, a return to American style apartheid.

New York Times. June 2, 1978. 1:5.

Among opponents to the tuition tax credit plan are Attorney General Griffin B. Bell and HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano, Jr. who believe that the bill would violate the constitutional principle of separation of church and state, and Representative William M. Ketchum who says people send children to private schools "of their own free will. Nobody has a gun at their backs." Proponents of the bill hail it as providing "freedom of choice in education," without which many private schools may close down and return their students to the public schools at a tremendous cost to the taxpayer.

"Private Education: A Tax Break? Packwood-Moynihan bill." Christianity Today. April 21, 1978. P.43.

A group of supporters to the tax credit proposal is listed, which includes Catholics, the Orthodox Jewish constituency, the Lutheran Church (Missouri-Synod), and the Christian Reformed Church. Groups opposing the measure include religious, labor,civil rights, and education organizations.

"School Tax Credits; Making New Converts." Christianity Today. September 22, 1978. Pp. 37-38.

Some endorsing the bill are Floyd Robertson from the National Association of Evangelicals; Robert Schuller and Jerry Falwell, two super church pastors; Pat Robertson, head of Christian Broadcasting Network; and Billy Graham. who says the bill will give parents more freedom of choice. Also, Roy Innes from the Congress on Racial Equality has agreed that some blacks support the bill now since it may stimulate the improvement of urban schools and divert power away from the educational establishment to the parents. Opposing the bill are the NEA, NAACP, various Jewish groups, and Senator Mark Hatfield who says the bill will kill public education while giving private schools windfall profits.

"Tax Credits and the poor; Packwood-Moynihan bill." America. February 18, 1978. P. 111.

Victor Solomon, Director of Educational Affairs for the Congress of Racial Equality notes that tax credit would start freeing the poor to go to nonpublic schools which are succeeding in the city with children of the same black poor that the public schools fail to educate. The critics of the bill are "highly placed," the American Federation of Teachers, President Carter and Secretary of HEW, who believes himself to be too wealthy to be able to receive benefits.

Sectarian Schools - Favorable

Benjamin, Rev. M. (Letter.) New York Times.
October 21, 1977. 30:1.

Benjamin refutes the argument that tax credit is like giving a rebate to people with a limousine or a large backyard. He says large cars and yards use up and waste resources, but private schools share the burden of providing education services to U.S. citizens, and often do a better job at it than the public schools.

Carter, President Jimmy. (Letter.) Momentum.
May 1978. P. 3.

President Carter states in his Presidential Campaign in 1976 that:

"We must develop... supportive programs at the national level for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools if we are to maintain a healthy diversity of educational opportunity for all our children... The right of millions of Americans to choose a religious education for their children lies at the core of America's diversity and strength. It is a right we dare not lose."

Cotter, William R. New York Times. May 7, 1978.
XXXIII, 20:1.

Cotter attacks some of the theories of opponents to the tax credit plan. He says he does not believe the bill will result in a mass exodus of students out of the public schools. Why would parents pull their students out of the public schools he argues, to save a little money but pay a bigger bill? As to the bill's constitutionality, Cotter says to let the courts decide that after the bill is passed. As to segregation fear, Cotter says the bill stipulates that schools must be tax exempt to qualify, and to be tax exempt they cannot discriminate on the basis of race.

Editorial. "Discrediting Tax Credits."
America. April 29, 1978. Pp. 334-5.

Critics say tax credit would destroy American public schools by giving more federal money to private school students than it presently gives to public school students. Supporters say the average per child expenditure for public schools ranges from $838 in Mississippi to $2,005 in New York, and that tax credits of up to $500 could not compete with that, while they would provide healthy competition and strengthen liberty by making freedom of educational choice a reality.

Editorial. "Tuition Tax Credits; Parochial Schools." America. August 26, 1978. P. 100.

The editor says that the questions are: Should the government foster both private and public schools or only the public? and Is it fair for parents to pay for the public schools while they believe in something else? He says the courts would eventually go along with the changing American views as they are expressed.

Evans, M. Stanton. "The Tuition War." National Review. January 20, 1978. P. 96.

Evans argues that inflation has caused a decline in private school enrollment and that the tuition tax credit bill would help remedy that. He says it would be no answer to tell students to all go to public schools because: it would be too costly ($17 billion in added tax funds to handle the influx of 7.7 million students) and it would destroy diversity in education.

Gallagher, Rev. Thomas G. (Letter.) New York Times. March 11, 1978. 22:1.

Gallagher says tax credits will break the monopoly on public government education and be a "means of assistance to parents to their constitutionally guaranteed right to choose the school of their choice.

Hamilton, Rev. Daniel S. (Letter.) New York Times. June 26, 1978. 18:4.

Hamilton contends that the argument that one might as well subsidize churches if one subsidizes church schools is faulty since taxes are not collected in behalf of a church, and it is not compulsory to attend one. On the other hand, he states it is mandatory to attend school and taxes are taken up for that purpose. He says it is not fair of those who pay taxes to derive no benefit from them except in state supported schools.

Kearney, Vincent S. "Of Many Things." America. October 28, 1978. P. 272.

Kearney contributes the defeat of the tax credit bill to anti-Catholic bigotry, as well as to the public school lobby fearful of quality competition. He admits the measure may have been ruled unconstitutional, but says other court decisions have been reversed in the past, and the bill could make it through someday if enough Catholic parents fight for it.

Meyers, John F. "Lest You Forget." Momentum. May 1978. P. 2.

Meyers reminds President Carter that his campaign promise to aid nonpublic schools should be campatible with the Packwood-Moynihan tax credit bill.

"Mixed Notices for Tax Credits." America. June 17, 1978. Pp. 473-4.

The article notes that because tax credits are powerfully appealing as immediate tax relief, and public perception of nonpublic schools has changed since 1950, President Carter may change his mind about the veto he promised. Also, there is wide support recently for tax credit for church schools since the poor think that they are more effective than public schools.

Moynihan, Daniel P. (Address.) New York Times. May 15, 1977. 26:6.

Moynihan said he hopes to reverse current Supreme Court rulings against aid to parochial schools, with the introduction of his tax credit bill. He is hopeful because both the Republican and Democratic platforms in 1976 endorsed the principle of federal aid to nonpublic schools.

Moynihan, Daniel P. New York Times. March 1, 1978. II, 14:1.

Moynihan comments on President Carter's proposal (NYT Mar. 1, 1978) to create a new Office of Nonpublic Education. Moynihan states that they already have such an office, headed by Dwight Crum, and have regarded abolishing that office. He further thinks that the president's comments will not help nonpublic school students as much as the tax credit proposal will.

Moynihan, Daniel P. "Government and the Ruin of Private Education." Harpers. April 1978. Pp. 28-38.

Moynihan cites recent support of private schools and then traces their history to origins of public education, clarifies the First Amendment and Supreme Court rulings and then concludes that what is needed in politics and education is pluralism. Tax credits will help bring this about he believes

Moynihan, Daniel P. "The Case for Tuition Tax Credits." Phi Delta Kappan. December 1978. Pp. 274-6.

Moynihan contends that the public school future is secure, that the tax credit bill is not just a boon to Catholics, and that tuition probably won't rise because of the bill since schools are finding it hard enough now to compete for students without pricing themselves out of the market. He says that liberty from the American public school monopoly and his day in court to decide the constitutionality of the bill is all he wants.

New York Times. September 27, 1977. 31:1

Senator Packwood says, "Education is a gourmet item," and his bill is a "revolutionary concept in self-help legislation." Taxpayers would subtract one-half the tuition per student up to $500 per student, directly from the income tax they owe.

Packwood, Bob & Moynihan, Daniel P. (Letter.) New York Times. October 28, 1977. 30:3.

Senators Packwood and Moynihan point out the merits of their bill. Tax credit they say would help people not currently in the aid mainstream, such as the single head-of-household and the 35 year old who need more education for a better job. It would also help the elementary and secondary student they say, and help reduce the "artificial distinction between 'public' and 'private' schools." They note that it would also help those who wish to patronize private schools now but can't, and that it is a normal risk to take that institutions might raise their tuition in the wake of such a bill.

Post, Vincent. New York Times. May 12, 1978. 29:2.

Post does not believe there will be a mass exodus from the public schools since over the years there has not been one. He also believes the tuition tax credit bill is necessary to "enable and not just permit all parents to exercise their right to choice in education."

Scanlon, Robert V. (Letter). New York Times May 23, 1978. 18:5.

Scanlon says that Rubin and Shanker "build up the straw man of a mass exodus from the public schools," and says that that kind of thing hasn't happened on the college level. He reasons the tax credit bill needs to be supported to make feasible the guarantee of the First Amendment, to those that seek a "value-oriented" education.

Sizer, Theodore R. (Letter.) New York Times. March 11, 1978. 22:1

Sizer argues that to say public schools are the "balance wheel of society" is simplistic and assumes that independently managed schools could not significantly serve the public interest. He opts for support of private schools in a democracy to be an alternative to politically managed and community segregated virtual monopolies of public schools.

Sutter, John Joseph. "A Call for Tuition Tax Credit." New York Times. December 18, 1977. XXI, 24:4.

Sutter calls for tax relief for students because of high inflation and heavy personal taxes. The two solutions he sees are the Packwood-Moynihan bill and the Tuition Tax Relief Act of 1977 introduced in the House by Delaney. He argues that grants are not enough and direct tax relief is needed. As to objections against the cost, he says it will lower the cost of public education, and safeguard the national interest by protecting freedom of choice for education.

"Time to Cut Strings." America. December 31, 1977. P. 470.

Wide congressional support of the tuition tax credit bill is noted. Senator Richard S. Schweiker notes that 51 percent of the students in nonpublic schools come from families with incomes of less than $15,000. He says that those families have a free choice to send their children to nonpublic schools but it is a free choice with tight financial strings attached, and "it's time to cut those strings."

Vitullo-Martin, Thomas. "Providing Choices for Education." America. September 9, 1978. PP. 128-130.

Vituallo-Martin argues that if families send their children to urban private schools because of tax credit aid, they will be kept from moving out to the suburbs and the urban tax base will be bolstered. Also, as private schools were aided they would exert pressure on public schools obliging them to reach for higher standards, and all would benefit.

Will, George. "How to Make Our Schools Better; Tuition Tax Credit Act." Newsweek. October 3, 1977. P. 104.

Will states that the cost of the tax credit is only one percent of the projected 1980 budget, or less than one-third of what it would cost should the 7.7 million students now in private schools start attending public schools. He states that the tax credit should be viewed in the same manner as tax deductible contributions to churches are viewed. Will contends that the Packwood-Moynihan bill is similar to an anti-trust bill, since the government has a near monopoly on education, and would nuture the diversity that the Constitution permits.

Vouchering - Favorable

Blum, Virgil C. "Quality Education for Inner-City Minorities." Vital Speeches. April 1, 1978. Pp. 362-366.

Blum attacks the "white flight" fear by quoting statistics of large percentages of non-white students in Catholic urban areas. He purports that high unemployment among blacks is due to functional illiteracy which is in turn due to low quality education. His solution to reverse this cycle is to start up-grading the quality of education an inner-city black has by giving him an education voucher which he can then spend at a high quality school, be it public or private.

Burns, Robert E. "Good Sense: Joust a Windmill Away in Michigan?" U.S. Catholic. January 1978. P.2.

A coalition of Roman Catholics, Missouri Synod Lutherans, and the Christian Reformed Church seeks to put a voucher proposal before the Michigan voters in 1978. Burns thinks that Catholics should wholeheartedly support this plan as they would have the most to gain thereby. As to the plan's constitutionality, he says no one challenged the G.I. Bill which let students go to private schools and receive aid.

Leary, Mary Ellen. "Another Chance for Vouchers?" Commonweal. September 29, 1978. Pp. 616-23.

Leary traces the origins of the voucher concept and a modified version (excluding church schools) which was tried in Alum Rock, California. She quotes Coons and Sugarman's statement of the purpose of vouchers: to put power of choice in the hands of parents. This would allow parents to send their child to any school, including Nazi or Communist, as long as the schools 1) follow all legal requirements and have open financial records, 2) accept all applicants who wish to enter, including the deviant, and 3) must not receive any outside funds.

Van Geel, Tyll. "Parental Preferences and the politics of spending public educational funds." Teachers College Record. February 1978. Pp. 339-63.

Past opposition to nonpublic schools is noted and then the history of the struggle to give parents control over the decision as to how tax money is spent. Van Geel reviews the rationale behind the voucher idea, how the federal government attempted to establish several experimental projects, how some modest reforms were conceived, and finally some lessons to learn from in planning future reforms.

Vouchering - Balanced

Coons, John E. and Sugarman, Stephen D. "Choice in Education: with Questions and Answers." Center Magazine. September 1978. Pp. 46-58.

Coons and Sugarman believe the parents need more choice in deciding which school their children will attend, and vouchers would put financial power in their hands to spend at the school of their choice. Thomas V. Martin believes many children will opt for private schools with a voucher system, while Gerald Hedden believes parents already have enough of a voice in choosing their child's education--by having the power to vote out school boards which they do not want.

Weber, William. "The Eclipse of Education Vouchers in America: The East Hartford Case." Journal of Education. May 1977. Pp. 36-42.

Weber traces the recent history of vouchers and why it never got off the ground in East Hartford. He notes the major components of the program (open enrollment, parent information, autonomy of schools, private schools, and transportation), and the difficulties encountered (including separation of church and state, teacher union resistance, and low public comprehension of the plan). Now he says the idea of vouchers in the United States is a moot policy idea.

Vouchering - Critical

Cookson, Clive. "Little Rank and File Support for Vouchers." Times Educational Supplement. July 21, 1978. P.9.

Cookson examines the weaknesses of the Alum Rock Voucher experiment as failing to include private schools in the choices available. The outcomes were that teachers gained a lot of power and influence (even though they worked extra without extra pay), and the diversity of the curriculum was increased. The parents did not increase their power, the NEA opposes the plan, and there is little popular support for vouchers.

Doerr, Edd. "The Voucher Menace." Humanist. November 1978. Pp. 51-52.

Doerr attacks the book Education and Choice by Coons and Sugarman as ignoring court rulings against parochiaid. Their plan, Doerr argues, would force taxpayers to support religious indoctrination in schools and would proliferate "ideology-oriented schools and one-room enterprises." He then goes on to quote a survey showing strong popular support of public schools which he states are "reasonably successful, stable, wholesome, and not unresponsive to improvement efforts."

Lubow, Arthur. "Another try for Vouchers? Theories of J.E. Coons and S.D. Sugarman." Newsweek. August 14, 1978. P.64.

Lubow says the voucher idea is viewed by conservatives as providing choice for families, and by left-wingers as a chance for students to be viewed as clients rather than wards. However, teachers hated the idea and the grassroots segment of the population opposed it. Lubow says the first experiment at Alum Rock after six years ended up being mostly controlled by the principals and now the school is almost no different than how it was before the voucher was tried.